DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 323 EC 306 408

AUTHOR Thurlow, Martha L.; Langenfeld, Karen; Nelson, J. Ruth; Shin, Hyeonsook; Coleman, Jo

TITLE State Accountability Reports: What Are States Saying about Students with Disabilities?

INSTITUTION National Center on Educational Outcomes, Minneapolis, MN.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1998-04-13
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; *Data Collection; *Disabilities; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Input Output Analysis; *Outcomes of Education; School Effectiveness; Special Education; *State Programs; Student Participation

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes a study that analyzed the state education accountability reports of 48 states and Washington, DC, and the inclusion of students with disabilities in the accountability systems. Extreme variability was found to exist in the reporting practices across states and there was little information on students with disabilities. Only 11 states included test-based outcome data for students with disabilities in their reports; 5 states produced a separate special education report. Many states included input/context and/or process indicators for students with disabilities, but few reported outcome data for these students. Finally, every state was unclear on at least one educational indicator in their accountability system and whether students with disabilities were included. The report includes the following recommendations regarding reporting on students with disabilities: (1) be clear about the role of students with disabilities in data and standards; (2) while special education reports can be useful in providing detailed information about students with disabilities, general accountability reports should also include information on students with disabilities; and (3) when making comparisons among schools, districts, and states, comparisons should be based on similar populations. (Contains 28 references.) (CR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 419 323

# State Accountability Reports: What are States Saying about Students with Disabilities?

Martha L.Thurlow, Karen Langenfeld, J. Ruth Nelson, Hyeonsook Shin, and Jo Coleman

National Center on Educational Outcomes
University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

April 13, 1998

NELSON

Paper presented at paper presentation "Accountability Initiatives from the State and District Perspectives," (Session 5.15) at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. Preparation of the paper was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Points of view or opinions expressed in the paper are not necessarily those of the Department or Offices within it.

EC 306408

# State Accountability Reports: What are States Saying about Students with Disabilities?

Martha L. Thurlow, Karen Langenfeld, J. Ruth Nelson, Hyeonsook Shin, and Jo Coleman

National Center on Educational Outcomes
University of Minnesota

Abstract

Public reports on education reflect the ways in which accountability is handled by the state. The extent to which students with disabilities are included in these reports is an important index of the extent to which responsibility is taken for the education of these students. We analyzed accountability reports sent to us by 48 states and Washington, DC. Extreme variability existed in reporting practices across states, and there was little information on students with disabilities. Only 11 states included test-based outcome data for students with disabilities in their reports; 5 states produced a separate special education report. Many states included input/context and/or process indicators for students with disabilities, but few reported outcome data for these students. Finally, every state was unclear on at least one educational indicator in their accountability system as to whether students with disabilities were included. Several recommendations are made regarding clear and inclusive reporting practices.

During the past five to ten years of education reform, policymakers, school administrators, legislators, and the general public have pressed to know whether education is working for students. In response to this, there have been developed outcomes-based accountability systems, which are systematic methods to assure those inside and outside the educational system that schools and students are moving toward desired goals (Brauen, O'Reilly, & Moore, 1994). An accountability system is more than the assessment of outcomes; it requires that student performance be reported routinely and that consequences follow (Brauen et al., 1994). According to Brauen et al., consequences may be distributed to either individuals, such as a student or teacher, or to systems, such as a program or school. Consequences may include sanctions, such as failure to graduate or loss of personnel, and/or rewards, such as public recognition of success or increased funding (Bond, Braskamp, & Roeber, 1996; Brauen et al., 1994; Geenen, Thurlow, & Ysseldyke, 1995).

The most common way of documenting progress for accountability systems has been through the development of state accountability reports that regularly present indicators of the status of public education, including student assessment data, data on students and teachers, and school finance data (CCSSO, 1995). Indicators are statistical measures of the educational system (College of Education & Human Development, 1996). In 1995, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) produced a document on state accountability reports based on a survey of state assessment directors. A partnership between CCSSO and the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) annually produces the State Student Assessment Program Database, which includes data from annual surveys of state assessment directors. These reports summarize state

reporting purposes, levels of statistics reported, frequency of reporting, whether these reports were mandated, and whether rewards and/or sanctions were attached to reporting in the state (Bond, Braskamp, & Roeber, 1996; CCSSO, 1995).

Until recently, little information was available on where students with disabilities fit into state accountability systems. Ysseldyke (1995) as quoted by Bond, Braskamp, and Roeber (1996) noted that 6 to 14 percent of the total tested elementary population and 5 to 10 percent of the total tested high school population were students with disabilities. Forty-one states allow students with disabilities to be excluded from the state assessment program (Thurlow, Scott, & Ysseldyke, 1995). These students can be exempted from the assessment if the assessment is not appropriate for them (content is not included in student's IEP), and for most states, a student is included or excluded based on IEP recommendations.

It also has been reported that even when students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment program, their scores might not be included in the state, district, or school averages (Erickson, Thurlow, & Ysseldyke, 1996). Thurlow, Scott, and Ysseldyke (1995b) further found that of the 24 states that described what they do with data on students with disabilities in their written guidelines, more than half (n=14) stated that data from students with disabilities were not included in their accountability reports; however, eight states did document the number of students excluded from the assessments. According to Elliott et al.(1996), it is not uncommon for those students with disabilities who do participate in assessments to have their scores deleted, their results shared only with parents, or no record kept of their test.

States vary in their reporting practices. As Elliott et al. (1996) pointed out, some states make decisions about reporting based on whether a student receives an accommodation or on what type of accommodation the student receives. It is also not uncommon for students with disabilities to be excluded from participation rates for the assessment. Elliott et al. contend that if students with disabilities are not assessed in some manner and their results are not reported, then accountability for the quality of their educational experience may be compromised.

To better understand the status of students with disabilities, we examined actual accountability reports from states, rather than analyzing policies or personnel reports about practice. We looked at the kind of accountability data reported, the presence of comparative data, and the breakdown of results for groups of students, particularly students with disabilities. Thus, our focus was on information that was not included in the CCSSO survey and State Student Assessment Programs Database. Our primary objective was to document the extent to which students with disabilities and their assessment results are included in state accountability reports, and to recommend ways to move toward systematic and inclusive reporting practices.

## Method

The accountability documents for this analysis were obtained by calling the state assessment directors or their designees in each of the 50 states and Washington DC, beginning in fall 1995. The calls were made based on the information from the CCSSO (1995) report, which listed accountability documents for each state. Unless otherwise indicated, our analysis is based solely on the information contained in the written documents, and not based on other sources of information. Accountability reports were collected from all states except California (testing program currently under revision), Minnesota (currently developing an accountability system), and Wyoming (no formal accountability documents available). We did not include reports of special studies or evaluations of specific programs in our analysis.

Each document was thoroughly examined, using a checklist of commonly used indicators of educational performance, and descriptive notes were made regarding each accountability document. The indicators were selected by first perusing several existing models of education (e.g., Oakes, 1986; Shavelson, McDonnell, & Oakes, 1989, Shavelson, McDonnell, Oakes, & Carey, 1987). In addition, several of the documents we had received were scanned to determine whether additional types of indicators were needed. The checklist and descriptive notes were completed simultaneously. Raters started at the beginning of each report, marking the indicators present and writing notes. Any information found on students with disabilities was noted.

## Limitations and Cautions

This analysis was limited by some of the following factors:

- ***Accountability systems are changing, dynamic processes.*** A detailed analysis of this type will necessarily have some information that is out of date by the time of publication. In addition, the documents we obtained contain data ranging from the 93-94 school year to the 95-96 school year.
- ***Different accountability systems have different definitions of accountability.*** Our requests were answered by state assessment directors in different ways. For example, some states included reports based solely on financial information. Other states may have had the same types of reports, but did not consider them to be accountability documents so they did not send them.
- ***This analysis is based on documents, not interviews or other sources of information.*** Exceptions include accountability information obtained through the World Wide Web.
- ***This analysis includes over 100 documents, obtained at various times from the fall of 1995 through May 1997.*** Many people have contributed to the daunting task of reading, and coding each report. Every effort was made to maintain internal consistency and reliability throughout this process. This was accomplished by repeated rechecking of coding, and final consistency checks by two individuals.

## Results

The following sections contain summary information about the accountability documents given to us by each of the states and Washington, DC. The information is presented in greater detail in **Technical Report 20**, and a set of **state summaries**, which are in a separate document available from NCEO (Thurlow, Langenfeld, Nelson, Shin, & Coleman, 1997).

How are the data reported?

There is a great amount of variability in accountability reporting across states. There is also variability within state documents when more than one report is produced by a single state. As shown in Table 1, a number of states compile their accountability data into a single report (n=16). Thirty-two states provided multiple accountability documents. Accountability documents ranged in length from two to approximately 600 pages. Unique documents included small pocket size reports or posters with general summary information.

Level of data. States also varied considerably in the level of data reported, which refers to the level of detail given in the accountability documents. Reports may provide state, district, and/or schoolwide averages for test data during a particular school year. States may have any combination of state, district, and school-level reporting, and these may vary from document to document, and from one indicator to another. Most states do provide accountability data at the state and district levels (N=41). Twenty-eight states actually report data at all three levels. Four states provide only state level data (Colorado, Iowa, Montana, and Oregon).

Focus of reporting. We looked at the focus of reports as being directed toward inputs/contexts, processes, or outcome indicators, where indicators are statistical measures of some aspect of the educational system (College of Education & Human Development, 1996). Our analysis revealed a great deal of variability in the focus of reports. In the analysis, "inputs/contexts" refers to accountability indicators that describe the student's learning environment as well as demographic characteristics, financial and human resources of the particular district's population (e.g., student-teacher ratio, cost) (1991). Process indicators describe student participation and school district evaluation (e.g., enrollment, attendance, accreditation status). Outcome indicators are nontest and test data indicators that focus on the end result of a student's learning process or are indices of the products of a reciprocal interaction between the individual and school or life experiences.

Of the states that sent us information, all but four (Delaware, Kentucky, Montana, and Washington) included information on the inputs/contexts of education for regular education students. All states but four (Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Washington) included information on the educational process. *All* states included information on the outcomes of education.

Purpose of Reporting. The majority (N=32) of states fell into the "other" category, with the majority of these stating the purpose of their reports was "to provide information," without mention of why the data were collected, or how the data should be used. Eight states use the information in their accountability reports for accreditation purposes, while five states report financial aid as a purpose of the accountability system. Technical assistance was cited as a purpose/consequence of the information in four states' accountability reports. Only one state used the information reported in its accountability document for diploma purposes. Twenty-eight states did not mention a purpose in at least one of their accountability documents.

High Stakes Testing Many reports do not mention the stakes attached to particular tests, or do not make the stakes of testing clear. For example, Texas only mentions that the TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) is a graduation exit exam in the glossary section of one of its documents. Several documents mention the TAAS without mentioning the stakes. Ohio sent us data without mention of how any of the tests reported are used. Of the 17 states that had a graduation exam at the time of this report, only one state (Virginia) stated this purpose clearly at the very beginning of the document when commenting on the purposes and consequences of its accountability system.

Target audience. The majority of states do not specify who their target audience is in the introduction to at least one of their reports, or in the title of their reports (N=31). While not shown on the figure, we also counted 14 states that did not specify a target audience in any of their reports. It is evident that:

- The most common target audience of reports is the general public (27 states).
- 18 states direct their reports to the government (local school boards, state legislature, or federal government).
- Teachers and administrators also appear to be an important audience as 16 states direct their reports to teachers and administrators and other school personnel.
- Only nine states specifically mention parents as the target audience (though parents are probably included under those reports directed to the general public)
- Reports directed at "other" audiences (n=6) included: special education community (from a special education document), students, researchers, and assessment personnel.

Types of indicators used. Accountability reports use a wide range of indicators. We found a variety of common and unique educational indicators. Examples of common indicators included such things as detailed financial information (such as levy data and expenditures), staffing information (such as teacher education), and postsecondary outcomes (such as percentage of students attending college or employment rates). Some unique indicators included absenteeism rates, student mobility rates, and minutes spent in math and reading.

Meeting State Standards. Some states report their assessment scores in terms of whether they met prescribed state standards (e.g., the percentage of students passing the standard of 50% on a nationally normed test). Our analysis of reports showed that 15 states reported whether their students met the prescribed state standards: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina. For the purposes of this analysis, we included those reports that mentioned standards, benchmarks or goals (including those in Goals 2000) when reporting data on students.

Many states, however, are unclear as to the relationships among curriculum, standards, and assessments. Kansas makes the link very clear in its single accountability document, giving data on students' performance as well as descriptions of innovative programs that demonstrate the link between curriculum and assessment. While it is clear in some of the reports that standards exist, it is often unclear whether students are meeting the standards, or what the specific standards are.

## What Do the Documents Look Like?

In thoroughly examining the reports of the 48 states (including Washington DC) that sent documents to us, we found 48 different approaches - all with different indicators highlighted or excluded. Many states use tables, spreadsheets, and even the Internet to communicate their results. A uniform format does not exist. If states provide test data, then the methods of reporting those data also vary considerably. We did find that two sections usually are included in reports: some type of outcome data and financial data for regular education students. Examples of different formats can be found in **Technical Report 20**. Some formats are more understandable than others, and some formats may be more useful for one type of audience (e.g., researcher, school administrator) but not for others (e.g. parents, general public).

## Students with Disabilities in Accountability Reporting

For every state that sent us a report, there was at least one educational indicator in at least one report for which it was not clear whether students with disabilities were included. As indicated in Table 1, of the 44 states that included input data, 13 included students with disabilities, either aggregated with the regular education data, or disaggregated as separate data. Similarly, for the 44 states with process data, 30 included (aggregated or disaggregated) data on students with disabilities. Thus, the most commonly reported information for students with disabilities was process information. From the data collected, it is evident that the most common educational indicator used for special education students is enrollment (N=25). Enrollment data for special education students often includes detailed information on the number of students in each disability category, average daily membership, and referral data. Other special education indicators included

special programs, and detailed expenditures. A few states included such indicators as time spent in regular education versus separate settings, number of students exiting special education and reasons for exit, staff and case load ratios, and racial/ethnic gender special education classification rates.

Outcome data, on the other hand, were aggregated or disaggregated for students with disabilities in only 11 of the 47 states plus Washington DC. In fact, close to half of the states provided information about the inputs/contexts and/or educational processes for students with disabilities, but did not mention anything about outcome data for students with disabilities. Table 2 provides a summary of the kind of outcome data included by the 11 states that report on these data. As indicated, few of these states include students with disabilities in all of their outcome measures. For those that do disaggregate data, it is often not clear whether the total scores include students with disabilities.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Ten states (Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Texas and West Virginia) specifically reported that they exclude students with disabilities' outcome data from at least one of their reports or do not include data on students with disabilities on one outcome indicator. These states were very clear as to what their reporting practices are when it comes to students with disabilities.

Accountability documents that reported on the exemption of students from testing were rare. Only eight states (Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Maryland, New York, Texas, Vermont, Washington) reported the number of students exempted from testing. Of those eight, four states specified the number of students with disabilities exempted from the test (Connecticut, New York, Texas, Washington). One state, Washington, requires districts to submit an "answer document" for every student that is enrolled. If a student is not tested, then districts must provide brief descriptive information about the student and indicate the reason he or she was not tested. Some of the reasons for exemption included: absent, special education student, limited English proficient student, withdrawn, student parent refusal, disruptive, temporary crisis, no reason given.

Many states do not mention whether students with disabilities are included in state standards. However, five states report whether students with disabilities have met state standards (Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina). While the term "all students" is mentioned often, a definition of "all" usually is not given.

Separate special education reports. Of the 47 states (plus Washington DC) that have a current accountability report, a handful devote a separate document to state special education student outcomes. Five states (Arkansas, Connecticut, Louisiana, New Jersey, and New York)

report on various indicators of special education students. Only Connecticut, Louisiana, and New York have test-based outcome data in the separate special education report. Ohio has a separate special education report, but it does not provide state level data. Connecticut indicates that it creates its special education report because it has the "duty to provide opportunities for all students with disabilities to achieve statewide student goals" (Special Education in Connecticut 1994-95, CT State Dept. of Education, January 1996, p. 1). New Jersey reports that its special education document is designed as a reference book to assist New Jersey's special education community in planning and evaluating educational efforts for pupils with educational disabilities. New York and Connecticut also specifically state in their reports that they compile this information in order to meet state requirements to describe special education programs, and educational results for students with disabilities; however, only three states (Connecticut, Louisiana, New York) also provide test data for students with disabilities in their reports. Of special note, Connecticut and New York also report the number of students exempted from testing in their special education reports. Of the states that produce a special education report, two states (Connecticut and New York) include information on special education students in another accountability document that the state annually produces.

Disaggregated special education student data. Of the 11 states that provide test-based outcome data on students with disabilities, 10 provide disaggregated test data. Eight states present these data in their regular accountability reports (Georgia, Kansas, North Carolina, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia) Two states present their test-based outcome data only in a separate special education report (Connecticut and Louisiana). New York presents data in both types of reports.

## Discussion

Variability is the best word to summarize what we found in our analysis of state reports. Accountability reports can contain a great deal of useful information, and serve many purposes for many different audiences. Many differences exist in the reporting of regular and special education. These differences are highlighted in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Accountability systems will always vary by state, according to the needs and circumstances relevant to that state; however, even within this needed variability, there are some common recommendations that are relevant to all states:

- Specify the target audience for each report, and gear the information to that audience.
- If possible, gain input from the targeted audiences on information needs.

- Provide a "Pyramid of information" with a brief, easy-to-understand report for quick reference, while also making more detailed information available to those who need it.
- Avoid a great deal of overlap between reports.
- Make the purpose of the accountability system clear, and provide the reader with information on the appropriate and inappropriate use of information (such as whether to make comparisons between districts).
- Choose educational indicators carefully and maintain some consistency among different reports.

We also have the following suggestions for reporting on students with disabilities.

- Be clear about the role of students with disabilities in data and standards. If making references to "all" students, then "all" students should include students with disabilities.
- While special education reports can be very useful in providing detailed information about students with disabilities, general accountability reports should also include information on students with disabilities.
- When making comparisons among schools, districts, and states, and even when making longitudinal comparisons, comparisons should be based on similar populations. It is important to know the characteristics of the students whose scores are being compared, such as the number of students with disabilities, the socioeconomic status of students, and other characteristics.

Public Law 105-17, the reauthorization of IDEA, was recently passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. It requires that students with disabilities be included in accountability reporting. Now is the time to look at how states approach accountability reporting, and incorporate suggestions for best practice in including data for students with disabilities in these reports. If students with disabilities are not included in accountability reporting, it is difficult for parents, educators, administrators, and public to know that these students are making adequate progress toward educational goals! Indeed, accountability reports will need to disaggregate the data of students with disabilities, choose educational indicators carefully, and provide clear information to all intended audiences.

## Reference

Arizona Department of Education. (1996). Arizona pupil achievement testing 1995-1996 school year. Phoenix, AZ: Author.

Bond, L.A., Braskamp, D., & Roeber, E. (1996). The status report of the assessment programs in the United States: State Student Assessment Programs Database school year 1994-1995. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers and North Central Regional Laboratory.

Brauen, M.L., O'Reilly, F., & Moore, J. (1994). Issues and options in outcomes-based accountability for students with disabilities. College Park, MD: Westat, Inc., and University of Maryland.

Bruininks, R.H., Deno, S.L., McGrew, K.S., Shriner, J.G., Thurlow, M.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1991). Assessing educational outcomes: State activity and literature integration (Synthesis Report 1). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

College of Education and Human Development. (1996). Minnesota educational accountability reporting system: Feasibility and design study (vol. 1). Minneapolis, MN: College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota.

Connecticut State Board of Education. (1997). Special education in Connecticut 1995-1996. Hartford, CT: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1995). State education accountability reports and indicator reports: Status of reports across the states 1995. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Elliott, J.L., Thurlow, M.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1996). Assessment guidelines that maximize the participation of students with disabilities in large-scale assessments: Characteristics and considerations (Synthesis Report 25). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Erickson, R.N., Thurlow, M.L., & Thor, K.A. (1995). State special education outcomes 1994. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Erickson, R.N., Thurlow, M.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1996). Neglected numerators, drifting denominators, and fractured fractions: Determining participation rates for students with disabilities in statewide assessment programs (Synthesis Report 23). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Geenen, K., Thurlow, M.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1995). A Disability perspective on five years of education reform (Synthesis Report 22). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Louisiana Department of Education Office of Research and Development. (1995). 1993-94 Louisiana progress profiles: District composite report of Catahoula Parish. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Department of Education.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1997). Special education: A statistical report for the 1995-1996 school year. Trenton, NJ: Author.

Oakes, J. (1986). Educational indicators: A guide for policymakers. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, Center for Policy Research in Education.

Oregon Department of Education. (1996). Oregon report card 1995-96: An annual report to the state legislature on Oregon public schools. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (1995). The Pennsylvania system of school assessment: 1994-95 school-by-school results. Harrisburg, PA: Author.

Rhode Island Department of Education. (1994). Rhode Island public schools: 1994 District profiles. Providence, RI: Author.

Shavelson, R., McDonnell, L., & Oakes, J. (1989). Indicators for monitoring mathematics and science education. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Shavelson, R., McDonnell, L., Oakes, J., & Carey, M. (1987). Indicator systems for monitoring mathematics and science education. RAND's report to the National Science Foundation (NSF). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

South Carolina Department of Education. (1995). Data update: 1995 results of the Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP). Columbia, SC: Author.

South Dakota Department of Education and Cultural Affairs. (1996). Education in South Dakota: A statistical profile. Pierre, SD: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1995). Glossary for the Academic Excellence Indicator System: 1994-95 Report. Austin, TX: Author.

Thurlow, M.L., Langenfeld, K.L.H., Nelson, J.R., Shin, H., & Coleman, J.E. (1997). State summaries: Information on accountability reports (Working Report 5). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Thurlow, M.L., Scott, D.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1995b). A compilation of states' guidelines for including students with disabilities in assessment (Synthesis Report 17). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Thurlow, M.L., Scott, D.L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1995a). A compilation of states' guidelines for accommodations in assessments for students with disabilities (Synthesis Report 18). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center for Educational Outcomes.

Virginia Department of Education. (1995). Summary of statewide results: 1995 Outcome accountability project. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Education.

Washington Department of Education. (1996). Fall 1995 district-level summaries: Grades 4, 8, and 11. Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Education.

Ysseldyke, J.E. (1996). Overview of the issues of participation and inclusion of students with disabilities in large-scale assessment programs. A presentation at a Council of Chief State School Officers SCASS Special Education Assessment meeting in Tampa, Florida.

**Table 1. Number of Documents Characteristics of Accountability System**

| | | | | Report Focus | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Inputs/Context | | Processes | | Outcomes | |
| | Single Account-ability Report | Multiple Reports | Separate Report for Special Ed. | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. |
| Alabama | | 2 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Excluded |
| Alaska | X | | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | % & # only |
| Arizona | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | Excl/Not spec |
| Arkansas | | 2 | X | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| California | Currently under revision | | | | | | | | |
| Colorado | X | | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Connecticut | | 2 | X | X | Disag/? | X | Disaggregated | X | Disag/? |
| Delaware | X | | | | | | | X | Agg/Excl/? |
| D.C. | X | | | X | ? | X | Agg/Disag/? | X | ? |
| Florida | | 2 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Georgia | | 5 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | Agg/Disagg/ Excl/Not spec |
| Hawaii | | 2 | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Idaho | | 2 | | X | Agg/? | | | X | ? |
| Illinois | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Indiana | | 2 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Iowa | X | | | X | Disag/? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Kansas | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | #/Disag/Not spec |
| Kentucky | | 2 | | | | X | ? | X | ? |
| Louisiana | | 3 | X | X | Excluded/? | X | Disag/Excl/? | X | Disag/Not spec/Excl |
| Maine | X | | | X | ? | X | Agg/Disag/? | X | ? |
| Maryland | X | | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Massachusetts | X | | | X | Disag/? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Michigan | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Minnesota | Currently under development | | | | | | | | |
| Mississippi | X | | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? |
| Missouri | | 2 | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | Excl/? |

**Table 1, cont.**

| | Single Accountability Report | Multiple Reports | Separate Report for Special Ed. | Report Focus: Inputs/Context | | Processes | | Outcomes | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. | Regular Ed. | Special Ed. |
| Montana | X | | | | | | | X | ? |
| Nebraska | | 2 | Under dev. | X | Excl/? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Nevada | X | | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| New Hampshire | | 4 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| New Jersey | | 3 | X | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | Excl/Disag |
| New Mexico | X | | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| New York | | 7 | X | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Agg/Disag/ Excl/? |
| North Carolina | | 6 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/Not spec |
| North Dakota | | 4 | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag | X | ? |
| Ohio | | 4 | | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Oklahoma | | 6 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Oregon | X | | | X | ? | X | Disag | X | ? |
| Pennsylvania | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Rhode Island | | 2 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Agg/Disag/ Not spec |
| South Carolina | | 5 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/Agg/ Not spec |
| South Dakota | X | | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Tennessee | | 2 | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Texas | | 4 | | X | Agg/Disag/? | X | Agg/Disag/? | X | Disag/Agg/Excl/ Not Spec |
| Utah | | 4 | | X | ? | X | Disag | X | ? |
| Vermont | | 4 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | ? |
| Virginia | | 2 | | X | ? | X | Disag/? | X | Disag/? |
| Washington | | 2 | | | | | | X | ? |
| West Virginia | X | | | X | ? | X | ? | X | Excl |
| Wisconsin | X | | | X | ? | X | ? | X | ? |
| Wyoming | No report available | | | | | | | | |

| Glossary of Indicators for Table 1 | |
|---|---|
| **Indicator/Term** | **Definition** |
| Inputs/Contexts | Accountability indicators that describe the student's learning environment as well as demographic characteristics of the particular district's population (e.g. staff ratios, cost, socioeconomic status). |
| Processes | Nontest accountability indicators that describe student participation and school district evaluation (e.g. enrollment, attendance, accreditation status). |
| Outcomes: | Data that focus on the end result of a student's learning process. Can include both test data (i.e. results of performance on achievement tests) or nontest data (e,g. drop-out rates, graduation rates). |

| Legend of Symbols for Table 1 | |
|---|---|
| **Symbol/Term** | **Definition** |
| X | The state does provide information on that indicator in at least one of its documents. |
| ?<br>Not specified (Not spec) | It is unclear or not specified whether students with disabilities were included in the data |
| Excluded (Excl) | Students with disabilities were not included in the data. |
| Aggregated (Agg) | Data for students with disabilities have been included with the regular education data. |
| Disaggregated (Disag) | Data for students with disabilities are reported separate from regular education data. |
| # tested (#) | Documents report the number of students who participated in testing. |
| % tested (%) | Documents report the % of students who were included in testing. |
| Combinations (e.g. Agg/Disag/Excl/Not spec) | Means that on different indicators or in different reports, data were aggregated, disaggregated, excluded or not specified. |

| Table 2: States that Report Test-Based Outcome Data for Students with Disabilities | | |
|---|---|---|
| **State** | **Name of Test** | **Notes on Reporting** |
| Connecticut | Connecticut Mastery Test | Statewide percentage of students and special education students at or above state goal. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included in the general test scores. |
| | Connecticut Academic Performance Test | Disaggregated data on students with disabilities. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included in the general test scores. These data are in a separate special education report. |
| Delaware | Interim Assessment Program | Aggregates all students with the exception of some Limited English Proficiency students and some special education students. Scores for students who were assessed with minor accommodations are aggregated into general test reporting and scores for students who were assessed with major accommodations were not included. Accountability report does not include definitions of major or minor accommodations. No disaggregated data are provided. |
| Georgia | Graduation Tests | Includes aggregated and disaggregated data on students with disabilities. Excludes students with disabilities from comparisons to prior years.<br><br>Students with disabilities are excluded from reporting on the Curriculum-Based Assessment Program.<br><br>It is not clear whether students with disabilities are included in the Writing Assessment for grades 5 & 8, Advanced Placement Exams, or in standardized achievement testing. |
| Kansas | Kansas Assessments in Mathematics, Reading, & Writing. | Lists the number of students with disabilities by category who were tested, but it is not clear whether these scores are aggregated into reported results. Does give disaggregated data for two outcomes. |
| Louisiana | CAT 5, ACT, SAT | Reports aggregated data for students identified as gifted/talented, speech impaired, and/or hospital/homebound only. Other students with disabilities are excluded. |
| | Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP), & Louisiana High School Graduation Exit Exam. | Disaggregates the percentage of students with disabilities attaining cutoff scores. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included with the regular test scores. These data are in a separate special education report. |

| Table 2, cont. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **State** | **Name of Test** | **Notes on Reporting** |
| New York | Pupil Evaluation Program Tests in Reading, Writing and Math. | Disaggregated data. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included with the regular test scores. |
| | Regents Preliminary Competency Tests, Regents Competency Test | Disaggregated data. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included with the regular test scores. |
| | Occupational Education Proficiency Examinations in communication systems, production systems, transportation systems, and clothing and textiles. | Reports data for students with disabilities and regular education students who are in vocational programs. Disaggregated data are presented in both separate and general reports. |
| North Carolina | End-of-grade and end-of -course tests in reading, writing and mathematics. | Disaggregated data. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included with the regular test scores.<br><br>It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included in standardized testing or in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). |
| Rhode Island | MAT7 | Disaggregated and aggregated data. |
| South Carolina | MAT7 | Disaggregated and aggregated data. |
| | South Carolina Basic Skills Assessment Program. | Disaggregated and aggregated data<br><br>It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included in reporting of Advanced Placement or college entrance examination (SAT/ACT) results. |
| Texas | Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), TAAS/TASP Equivalency Test (secondary exit exam), End-of-course Biology Exam, ACT, SAT | Disaggregated data. It is not clear whether students with disabilities were included with the regular test scores.<br><br>Students may be exempted from the TAAS if they (1) have received a special education exemption as determined by a review committee and specified in the students' IEP, or (2) have received a Limited English Proficiency exemption, as determined by a review committee. |
| Virginia | Virginia Literacy Passport Tests in reading, writing and mathematics for Grade 6. | Disaggregated results. Students with disabilities who are pursuing a special diploma are not required to participate in the Literacy Testing Program.<br><br>It is not clear whether students with disabilities are included in standardized testing or in Advanced Placement exams. |

| Table 3 Regular Versus Special Education in State Accountability Reporting | |
|---|---|
| **Regular Education** | **Students with Disabilities** |
| All states report outcome data. | Few states report outcome data for students with disabilities. |
| Most states report on a variety of educational indicators, with inputs, processes and outcomes included. | Cost data (inputs) and enrollment (process) are the most commonly reported educational indicators. |
| Most states report regular and special education in the same report. | Every state reports some data for which it is unclear whether students with disabilities were included.<br><br>Of the five states with a special education report, two states do not mention students with disabilities in any other report. |